REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 14-22, 25 and 26 are pending.

Independent claims 25 and 26, as well as all dependent claims, except for claims 17, 19 and 22, were rejected for anticipation by Moed (5,770,841).

Independent claims 25 and 26 are for a system and a method, respectively, for controlling the operation of equipment, such as machinery processing a substance or product which is typically inside a container. The container (or substance) carries two types of information, substance or product identifying information, referred to as "first information" in the claims, which is product-dependent, such as technical data concerning the product, and manufacturer-dependent information, such as a trademark, referred to as "second information" in the claims, which can be the same for some or all products for a given manufacturer, for example. The second information "can be detected by a human eye and is distinctive to a human viewer" (claim 25, method claim 26 using virtually identical language but employing method terminology).

The present invention provides, and independent claims 25 and 26 require, that information corresponding to the second (visible) information is stored in a memory and includes "an evaluating device for comparing read second information with the authorizing information stored in the memory, the evaluating device enabling the operation of the item of equipment when the read second information coincides with the stored authorizing information by generating an enabling signal permitting operation of the item of equipment, *and not enabling the operation of the item of equipment when the read second information does not coincide with the stored authorizing information*" (claim 25). Method claim 26 is similarly limited and requires amongst others "comparing the read second information of the second region with the stored information sample, generating a signal when the read second information coincides with the stored information sample which permits operation of the item of equipment, *and preventing the operation of the item of equipment when the read second information does not coincide with the stored information sample*".

Thus, the product or substance subject to control carries information which can be viewed and interpreted by the human eye, and this information is checked against corresponding

information stored in memory. If the two coincide, e.g. are the same, the equipment subject to control is permitted to operate. If, however, there is a discrepancy between the read and stored information, *the operation of the equipment under control is interrupted.*

The anticipation rejection of claims 25 and 26 over Moed holds, amongst others, that "if the read information does not coincide with the stored information ... operation of the item of equipment [is disabled] (i.e., when the system is unable to verify a decoded destination address by reference to the U.S. postal service's Zip+4 for the package, the system *disables the normal continuing the packaging processing* by displaying the destination address on the workstation, therefore, an operator can review and make a manual correction)". (Final Rejection, page 3, last paragraph, italics added).

Moed teaches, and Fig. 4 thereof illustrates, that the OCR processed destination address on a package or a letter is validated or verified at step 424 (Fig. 4) by attempting to match it with an address in the Zip+4 database, which has an exhaustive list of valid U.S. addresses. (Column 13, lines 24-28). If the decoded destination address does not match a valid Zip+4 database address, the system attempts to automatically correct the wrong address at step 430. (Column 13, lines 41-44).

If the attempt to automatically correct the address fails, the incorrect destination address and the closest possible addresses from the database are displayed (step 508, Fig. 5) and "At step 510 .... [t]he operator manually enters the correct destination address by selecting the correct address from the closest possible matches ...." (Column 14, lines 40-44). If the operator selected an address from the Zip+4 database, the selected address is validated and the verification ends. If, however, the destination address was typed by the operator, the address is validated at step 516, which

> determines whether the keyed in address matches a valid address from the database. If not, the method also attempts to correct common key entry mistakes in order to see if the corrected key entered data matches one of the addresses from the database .... The correction can be carried out by attempting to match a valid address from any address in the ZIP+4 database, or by trying to match one of the few close addresses transferred to the image display workstation from the label decoding system.

> After the manually entered destination address data is validated, the method proceeds to step 514 and returns the correct destination address to the image server 29, which returns the data to the label decoding system 14. The method 500 then terminates at step 518.

The Moed patent provides no information at all what happens in the event the operator cannot find a match for the address in the Zip+4 database. The operator is on his own in such a situation and finds no guidance whatsoever in Moed what he could or should do next.

Moed teaches that the operator of the device can attempt to conform the address in question to a ZIP+4 address as shown in Fig. 5. In the system of the present invention, this is not possible. The present invention does not seek to conform the "second information" (e.g. a trademark) on the product to the second information stored in memory. Quite to the contrary, the present invention seeks to find out if the two coincide. If they do, the process or system is permitted to continue operating. If they don't, the system is deactivated but no attempt is made to "correct" the second information on the product and/or in the memory.

Contrary to the statement in the last paragraph on page 3 of the final rejection that "an operator can review and make a manual correction" in his attempt to match the destination address to a Zip+4 database address, Moed does not teach what he can or should do when the operator's attempt is unsuccessful.

This is precisely the point where the present invention provides a solution. If the read and stored second information (e.g. trademark) do not match, claim 25 requires:

> ... and <u>not enabling the operation of the item of equipment</u> when the read second information does not coincide with the stored authorizing information.

Similarly, claim 26 requires:

> ... and <u>preventing the operation of the item of equipment</u> when the read second information does not coincide with the stored information sample.

As the foregoing demonstrates, Moed teaches how to correct an address so it matches a ZIP+4 address. Moed does not say what to do when the two cannot be matched.

The present invention, as defined by claims 25 and 26, has no interest in correcting or changing the second information on the product and/or in memory. It is only interested in whether or not the two match. If they do not, the machinery is disabled.

Since Moed contains no disclosure whatsoever about disabling or preventing the operation of machinery if the read and stored second information on the product and in memory does not match, Moed does not anticipate the claims.

In this context, applicant strongly disagrees, as already mentioned above, that verifying that the destination address corresponds to a ZIP+4 address and displaying destination addresses on the workstation so that the operator can manually correct it is the same or analogous to disabling machinery in accordance with the present invention when the read and stored second information do not match. When the destination address is displayed at Moed's workstation, the operator performs an address checking and correcting function. In the present invention, the second information, which is analogous to Moed's destination address, is also checked, but it is not corrected when there is no match. Instead, the non-match is used for "*not enabling the operation of the item of equipment when the read second information does not coincide with the stored authorizing information*" (claim 25).

Moed contains no suggestion, teaching or disclosure to use its address checking and correcting system for controlling, i.e. selectively disabling, attached machinery. No machinery is attached to and/or controlled by the address checking system of Moed.

Applicant also disagrees with the observation on page 7 of the final rejection that:

"The claimed limitations includes

> '*a memory storing authorizing information for the substance*' (in claim 25);
>
> '*storing an information sample which corresponds to the second information*' (in claim 26); and
>
> the read second information is compared with the stored data.

Therefore, Moed clearly teaches the address scanned is compared with an address in the U S postal Service's zip code +4 database. Therefore, given a broadest interpretation of the claim, Moed anticipates the claimed limitation (see the discussion above)"

Although claims 25 and 26 recite a memory and storing an information sample and that the read second information is compared with the stored data, this is not the end of the claim.

As discussed in detail above, claims 25 and 26 additionally require disabling the machinery when the read and stored second information (destination address and ZIP+4 code in Moed) do not match. Reading and comparing the read information to the stored information and correcting one of them when there is a mismatch, as is done by Moed, is also not the same as reading and comparing the read and stored information and not correcting either but, instead, disabling a piece of machinery when there is no match, as is recited in claims 25 and 26.

In view thereof, applicant requests retraction of the anticipation rejection of independent claims 25 and 26.

Since the dependent claims all contain the same limitations by virtue of their dependencies from the independent claims, the dependent claims are also not anticipated

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, applicant submits that none of the claims are anticipated by Moed, and all claims are allowable thereover. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is therefore requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Georg Seka
Reg. No. 24,491

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: (415) 576-0200
Fax: (415) 576-0300
JGS:jhw